U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/708,496**
Amendment filed March 10, 2008
Reply to OA dated December 11, 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are pending, of which claims 1, 5, and 6 have been amended herein.

A.   <u>The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for</u>

<u>indefiniteness.</u>

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, for the following reasons.

The Examiner has suggested that **claim 1** is unclear and indefinite because of this text:
"creating a transmission frame when said parameter agrees with its own node ID having a default
node ID0 allotted to each node as an initial value" (Office Action dated December 11, 2007, page
2, paragraph 2). <u>Applicant submits respectfully that this rejection of claim 1 is improper and should</u>
<u>be withdrawn, **because claim 1 does not include that text**.</u>

Upon additional careful review, Applicant believes that the language set forth in **claim 2** is
clear and definite, and thus this rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn.

This rejection of **claims 3 and 4** should be withdrawn, because, upon additional careful
review, the language of claims 1-4 believed to be clear and definite.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/708,496**
Amendment filed March 10, 2008
Reply to OA dated December 11, 2007

The Examiner has suggested that **claim 5** is unclear and indefinite because of this text: "creating a transmission frame when said parameter agrees with its own node ID having a default node ID0 allotted to each node as an initial value" (Office Action dated December 11, 2007, page 2, paragraph 2). <u>Applicant submits respectfully that this rejection of claim 5 is improper and should be withdrawn, **because claim 5 does not include that text**.</u>

Regarding **claim 6**, the Examiner has suggested that claim 6 is indefinite because there are "no details of how the frame is created" and because claim 6 is unclear and indefinite. At this time, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. All features set forth in claim 6 are clear and definite, and claim 6 sets forth adequate detail regarding claimed features. Accordingly, Applicant submits respectfully that this rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn.

<u>B.   The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,684,956 (**Billings**) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,479,613 (**Geyer et al.**).</u>

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, for the following reasons.

Billings and **Geyer et al.**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features set forth in claim 1, as amended, including at least the following features:

> a control means for setting a node ID of said information processing terminal to be equal to a default node ID0, for managing a parameter incremented whenever the idle time unit is detected as a result of count-up by said counting means, for creating a transmission frame with said node ID and without transmission data when transmission data is not present and said parameter is equal to said node ID of said information processing terminal, and for creating a transmission frame with said node ID and with transmission data when transmission data is present and said parameter is equal to said node ID of said information processing terminal.

Billings and **Geyer et al.**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in claim 5, as amended: "transmitting a transmission frame inclusive of the node ID and transmission data when transmission data is present and said parameter agrees with the node ID; and transmitting a transmission frame with the node ID and without transmission data when transmission data is not present and said parameter agrees with the node ID," in combination with the other claimed features.

Billings and **Geyer et al.**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the following features set forth in claim 6, as amended: "creating a transmission frame inclusive of the node ID and transmission data when transmission data is present and said parameter agrees with the node ID; and creating a transmission frame with the node ID and without transmission data when transmission data is not present and said parameter agrees with the node ID," in combination with

the other claimed features.

Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection of claims 1, 5, and 6 should be withdrawn. This rejection of claims 2-4 should be withdrawn by virtue of their dependency.

C. Specification

Some informalities in the specification have been corrected herein.

D. Certified Copy of Priority Document

The certified copy of the priority document was filed in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 9, 2004. The Examiner is kindly requested to confirm receipt of such document in the next Office Action (for example, by marking the appropriate boxes in paragraph 12 on the "Office Action Summary" page of the next Office Action).

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/708,496**
Amendment filed March 10, 2008
Reply to OA dated December 11, 2007

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an

appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other

fees which may be due now or in the future with respect to this application, to Deposit Account No.

01-2340.

<div align="center">

Respectfully submitted,
KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

Darren Crew
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 37,806

</div>

DC/llf
Atty. Docket No. **040105**
Suite 400
01420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930

<div align="center">

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

</div>